SUPPLEMENT TO THE

New-Hampshire Patriot.

CONCORD, (N. H.) TUESDAY, JUNE 30, 1812.

THE MANIFESTO.

THE COMMITTEE OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, TO WHOM WAS REFERRED THE MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, OF THE FIRST OF JUNE, ONE THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND TWELVE,

REPORT—

THAT after the experience which the United States have had of the great injustice of the British government towards them, exemplified by so many acts of violence and oppression, it will be more difficult to justify to the impartial world their patient forbearance, than the measures to which it has become necessary to resort, to avenge the wrongs, and vindicate the rights and honor of the nation. Your committee are happy to observe, on a dispassionate review of the conduct of the United States, that they see in it no cause for censure.

If a long forbearance under injuries ought ever to be considered a virtue in any nation, it is one which peculiarly becomes the United States. No people ever had stronger motives to cherish peace: none have ever cherished it with greater sincerity and zeal.

But the period has now arrived, when the United States must support their character and station among the nations of the earth, or submit to the most shameful degradation. Forbearance has ceased to be a virtue. War on the one side and peace on the other, is a situation so unnatural as it is disgraceful. The mad ambition, the lust of power, and commercial avarice of Great Britain, arrogating to herself the complete dominion of the ocean, and exercising over it an unbounded and lawless tyranny, have left to neutral nations an alternative only, between the base surrender of their rights, and a manly vindication of them. Happily for the United States, their destiny, under the aid of Heaven, is in their own hands. The crisis is formidable only by their love of peace. As soon as it becomes a duty to relinquish that situation, danger disappears. They have suffered no wrongs, they have redressed no injuries, however great, for which they cannot obtain redress.

More than seven years have elapsed, since the commencement of this system of hostile aggression by the British government on the rights and interests of the United States. The manner of its commencement was not less hostile, than the spirit with which it has been prosecuted. The U. S. have vainly done every thing in their power to preserve the relations of friendship with G. Britain. Of this disposition they gave a distinguished proof, at the moment when they were made the victims of an opposite policy. The wrongs of the last war had not been forgotten at the commencement of the present one. They warned us of the danger, against which it was our part to provide. As early as the year 1804, the Minister of the U. States at London was by [illegible] the British government to enter into a negociation on all the points on which a collision might arise between the two countries, in the course of the war, and to propose to it an arrangement of their claims on fair and reasonable conditions. The invitation was accepted. A negociation had commenced and was depending, and nothing had occurred to excite a doubt that it would not terminate to the satisfaction of both the parties. It was at this time, and under these circumstances, that an attack was made, by surprise, on a important branch of the American commerce, which affected every part of the United States, and involved many of their citizens in ruin.

The commerce on which this attack was so unexpectedly made, was between the United States and the colonies of France and Spain, and other enemies of Great Britain. A commerce just in itself, sanctioned by the example of G. Britain as regard to the trade with her own colonies; sanctioned by a solemn act between the two governments in the last war; and benefitting by the practice of the British government in the present war, more than two years having elapsed, without any interference with it.

The injustice of this attack could only be equalled by the absurdity of the pretext alleged for it. It was pretended by the British government, that in case of war, her enemy had no right to modify its colonial regulations, so as to confer on the colonies of war the inhabitants of the colonies. This pretension, peculiar to Great Britain, is utterly incompatible with the right of sovereignty in every independent state. It was recited in the well established and universally limited law of nations which had no sanction to it, in the general code. The sovereignty of every state is co-extensive with its dominions, and cannot be abridged, or contained in its rights, as to any point, except by conquest. Neutral nations have a right to trade to every part of either belligerent, which is not legally blockaded; and to all articles which are not contraband of war. Such is the absurdity of the pretension, that your committee are unwilling, especially after the able manner in which it has been heretofore exposed, and exploded, that they would offer an insult to the understanding of the House, if they enlarged on it, and if any thing could add to the high sense of the injustice of the British government in the transaction, it would be the extreme which her conduct exhibits in regard to this trade, and in regard to a similar trade by neutrals with her own colonies. It is known to the world, that G. Britain regulates her own trade, in war and in peace, with her colonies, as she thinks for her interest—that in war she relaxes the restraints of her colonial system in favor of the colonists, and that it has never been suggested that she had not a right to do it, or that a neutral in taking advantage of the relaxation violated a belligerent right, or [illegible] enemy. But with G. Britain every thing is lawful. It is only a trade with enemies that the United States can do wrong. With them all trade is unlawful.

In the year 1756 an attack was made by the British government on the same branch of our commerce, which had nearly involved the two countries in war. That difference unnecessarily was commanded. The pretension was withdrawn, and reparation made to the United States for the losses which they had sustained. It was fair to infer from the arrangement that the commerce was deemed by the British government lawful, and that it would not be again disturbed.

Had the British government been resolved to contest this trade with neutrals, it was due to the character of the British nation that the decision should be made known to the government of the United States. The existence of a negociation which had been invited by our government, for the purpose of preventing differences by an amicable arrangement of their respective pretentions, gave a strong claim to the notification, while it afforded the fairest opportunity for it. But a very different policy animated the then cabinet of England. The liberal confidence and friendly overtures of the United States were taken advantage of to ensnare them. Steady to its purpose and inflexibly hostile to this country, the British government calmly looked forward to the moment when it might give the most deadly wound to our interests. A trade just in itself, which was secured by so many strong and sacred pledges, was considered safe. Our citizens with their usual industry and enterprize had embarked in it a vast proportion of their shipping, and of their capital, which were at sea, under no other protection than the law of nations, and the confidence which they reposed in the justice and friendship of the British nation. At this period the unexpected blow was given. Many of our vessels were seized, carried into port and condemned by a tribunal, which while it professes to respect the law of nations, obeys the mandates of its own government. Hundreds of other vessels were driven from the ocean, and the trade itself in a great measure suppressed. The effect produced by this attack on the lawful commerce of the U. States was such as might have been expected from a virtuous, independent and highly injured people. But one sentiment pervaded the whole American nation. No local interests were regarded; no sordid motives felt. Without looking to the parts which suffered most, the invasion of our rights was considered a common cause, and from one extremity of our Union to the other, was heard the voice of an united people, calling on their government to assert their wrongs, and vindicate the rights and honor of the country.

From this period the British government has gone on in a continued encroachment on the rights and interests of the United States, disregarding in its course, in many instances, obligations which have heretofore been held sacred by civilized nations.

In May, 1806, the whole coast of the continent from the Elbe to Brest inclusive, was declared to be in a state of blockade. By this act, the well established principles of the Law of nations, principles which have served for ages as guides, and fixed the boundary between the rights of belligerents and neutrals, were violated: By the law of nations, as recognized by Great Britain herself, no blockade is lawful, unless it be sustained by the application of an adequate force, and that an adequate force was applied to this blockade, in its full extent, might not to be presumed. Whether Great Britain was able to maintain, legally, so extensive a blockade, considering the war in which she is engaged, requiring such extensive naval operations, is a question which it is not necessary at this time to examine. It is sufficient to be known, that such force was not applied, and this is evident from the terms of the blockade itself, by which, comparatively, an inconsiderable portion of the coast only was declared to be in a state of *strict and rigorous blockade*. The objection to the measure is not diminished by that circumstance. If the force was not applied, the blockade was unlawful from whatever cause the failure might proceed. The belligerent who institutes the blockade cannot absolve itself from the obligation to apply the force under any pretext whatever. For a belligerent to relax a blockade, which it could not maintain, it would be a refinement in injustice, not less insulting to the understanding than repugnant to the law of nations. To claim merit for the mitigation of an evil, which the party either had not the power or found it inconvenient to inflict, would be a new mode of encroaching on neutral rights—Your committee think it just to remark that this act of the British government does not appear to have been adopted in the sense in which it has been since construed. On consideration of all the circumstances attending the measure, and particularly the character of the distinguished statesman who announced it, we are persuaded that it was conceived in a spirit of conciliation and intended to lead to an accommodation of all differences between the United States and Great Britain. His death disappointed that hope, and the act has since become subservient to other purposes. It has been made by his successors a pretext for the vast system of usurpation, which has so long oppressed and barrassed our commerce.

The next act of the British government which claims our attention is the order of council of January 7, 1807, by which neutral powers are prohibited trading from one port to another of France or her allies, or any other country with which Great Britain might not freely trade. By this order the pretension of England, heretofore claimed by every other power, to prohibit neutrals disposing of parts of their cargoes at different ports of the same enemy, is revived and with vast accumulation of injury. Every enemy, however great the number or distant from each other, is considered one, and the like trade even with powers at peace with England, who, from motives of policy, had exempted or restrained her commerce, was also prohibited. In this act the British government evidently disclaimed all regard for neutral rights. Aware that the measure authorised by it could find no pretext in any belligerent right, none was urged. To prohibit the sale of our produce, consisting of innocent articles at any port of a belligerent, not blockaded, to consider every belligerent as one, and subject neutrals to the same restraints with all, as if there was but one, were bold encroachments. But to restrain in any manner to interfere with our commerce with neutral nations with whom Great Britain was at peace, and against whom she had no justifiable cause of war, for the sole reason, that the restrained or excluded from their ports her commerce, was utterly incompatible with the pacific relations subsisting between the two countries.

We proceed to bring into view the British order in council of November 11th, 1807, which superceded every other order, and consummated that system of hostility on the commerce of the United States which has been since so steadily pursued. By this order all France and her allies and every other country at war with Great Britain, or with which she was not at war, from which the British flag was excluded and all the colonies of her enemies, were subjected to the same restrictions as if they were actually blockaded in the most strict and rigorous manner, and all trade in articles the produce and manufacture of the said countries and colonies and the vessels engaged in it were subjected to capture and condemnation as lawful prize. To this order certain exceptions were made which we forbear to notice, because they were not adopted from a regard to neutral rights, but were dictated by policy to promote the commerce of England, and so far as they related to neutral powers, were said to emanate from the clemency of the British government.

It would be superfluous in your committee to state, that by this order the British government declared direct and positive war against the United States. The dominion of the ocean was completely usurped by it, all commerce forbidden and every flag driven from it or subjected to capture and condemnation, which did not subserve the policy of the British government by paying it a tribute and sailing under its sanction. From this period the United States have incurred the heaviest losses and most mortifying humiliations. They have borne the calamities of war without retorting them on its authors.

So far your committee has presented to the view of the House the aggressions which have been committed under the authority of the British government on the commerce of the United States. We will now proceed to other wrongs which have been still more severely felt. Among these is the impressment of our seamen, a practice which has been unceasingly maintained by Great Britain in the wars to which she has been a party since our revolution. Your committee cannot convey in adequate terms the deep sense which they entertain of the injustice and oppression of this proceeding. Under the pretext of impressing British seamen, our fellow-citizens are seized in British ports, on the high seas, and in every other quarter to which the British power extends, are taken on board British men of war and compelled to serve there as British subjects. In this mode our citizens are wantonly snatched from their country and their families, deprived of their liberty and doomed to an ignominious and slavish bondage, compelled to fight the battles of a foreign country, and often to perish in them. Our flag has given them no protection; it has been unceasingly violated and our vessels exposed to danger by the loss of the men taken from them. Your committee need not remark that while the practice is continued, it is impossible for the United States to consider themselves an independent nation. Every new case is a new proof of their degradation. Its continuance is the more unjustifiable because the United States have repeatedly proposed to the British government an arrangement which would secure to it the control of its own people. An exemption of the citizens of the United States from this degrading oppression and their flag from violation, is all that they have sought.

The lawless waste of our trade and equally unlawful impressment of our seamen, have been much aggravated by the insults and indignities attending them. Under the pretext of blockading the ports and harbors of France and her allies, British squadrons have been stationed on our own coast, to watch and annoy our own trade. To give effect to the blockade of European ports, the ports and harbors of the United States have been blockaded. In executing these orders of the British government, or in obeying the spirit which was known to animate it, the commanders of these squadrons have encroached on our jurisdiction, seized our vessels and carried into effect impressments within our limits, and done other acts of great injustice, violence and oppression. The United States have seen with mingled indignation and surprize, that these acts, instead of procuring to the perpetrators the punishment due to their crimes, have not failed to recommend them to the favor of their government.

Whether the British government has contributed by active measures to excite against us the hostility of the savage tribes on our frontiers, your committee are not disposed to occupy much time in investigating. Certain indications of general notoriety may supply the place of authentic documents; though these have not been wanting to establish the fact in some instances. It is known that symptoms of British hostility towards the U. States have never failed to produce corresponding symptoms among those tribes. It is also well known that on all such occasions, abundant supplies of the ordinary munitions of war have been afforded by the agents of British commercial companies, and even from British garrisons, wherewith they were enabled to commence that system of Savage warfare on our frontiers which has been at all times indiscriminate in its effect, on all ages, sexes and conditions, and so revolting to humanity.

Your committee would be much gratified if they could close here the detail of British wrongs; but it is their duty to recite another act of still greater malignity, than any of those which have been already brought to your view. The attempt to dismember our union and overthrow our excellent constitution, by a secret mission, the object of which was, to foment discontents and excite insurrection against the constituted authorities and laws of the nation, as lately disclosed by the agent employed in it, affords full proof that there is no bound to the hostility of the British government towards the United States—no act, however unjustifiable, which it would not commit to accomplish their ruin. This attempt excites the greater horror from the consideration that it was made while the United States and Great Britain were at peace, and an amicable negociation was depending between them for the accommodation of their differences through public ministers regularly authorised for the purpose.

The United States have beheld, with unexampled forbearance, this continued series of hostile encroachments on their rights and interests, in the hope, that, yielding to the force of friendly remonstrances, often repeated, the British government might adopt a more just policy towards them; but that hope no longer exists. They have also weighed impartially the reasons which have been urged by the British government in vindication of those encroachments, and found in them neither justification or apology.

The British government has alledged in vindication of the orders in council that they were resorted to as a retaliation on France, for similar aggressions committed by her on our neutral trade with the British dominions. But how has this plea been supported? The dates of British and French aggressions are well known to the world. Their origin and progress have been marked with too wide and destructive a waste of the property of our fellow-citizens, to have been forgotten. The decree of Berlin of Nov. 21st, 1806, was the first aggression of France in the present war. Eighteen months had then elapsed, after the attack made by Great Britain on our neutral trade, with the colonies of France and her allies, and six months from the date of the proclamation of May, 1806. Even on the 7th Jan. 1807, the date of the first British order in council, so short a term had elapsed, after the Berlin decree, that it was hardly possible that the intelligence of it should have reached the U. States. A retaliation which is to produce its effect, by operating on a neutral power, ought not to be resorted to till the neutral had justified it by a culpable acquiescence in the unlawful act of the other belligerent. It ought to be delayed until after sufficient time had been allowed to the neutral to remonstrate against the measure complained of, to receive an answer, and to act on it, which had not been done in the present instance; and when the order of November 11th was issued, it is well known that a minister of France had declared to the minister plenipotentiary of the U. States at Paris, that it was not intended that the decree of Berlin should apply to the U. States. It is equally well known, that no American vessel had then been condemned under it, or seizure been made, with which the British government was acquainted. The facts prove incontestibly, that the measures of France, however unjustifiable in themselves, were nothing more than a pretext for those of England. And of the insufficiency of that pretext, ample proof has already been afforded by the British government itself, and in the most impressive form. Although it was declared that the orders in council were retaliatory on France for her decrees, it was also declared, and in the orders themselves, that owing to the superiority of the British navy, by which the fleets of France and her allies were confined within their own ports, the French decrees were considered only as empty threats.

It is no justification of the wrongs of one power, that the like were committed by another; one ought the fact, if true, to have been urged by either, as it could afford no proof of its love of justice, of its magnanimity, or even of its courage. It is more worthy the government of a great nation, to relieve than to assail the injured. Nor can a repetition of the wrongs by another power repair the violated rights, or wounded honor, of the injured party. An utter inability alone to resist, would justify a quiet surrender of our rights, & degrading submission to the will of others. To that condition the U. S. are not reduced nor do they fear it. That they have consented to discuss with either power the misconduct of the other, is a proof of their love of peace, of their moderation, and of the hope which they still indulged that friendly appeals to just and generous sentiments would not be made to them in vain. But the motive was mistaken, if their forbearance was imputed, either to the want of a just sensibility to their wrongs, or of a determination, if suitable redress was not obtained, to resent them. The time has now arrived when this system of reasoning must cease. It would be insulting to repeat it. It would be degrading to hear it. The U. States must act as an independent nation, and assert their *rights* and avenge their *wrongs*, according to their own estimate of them, with the party who commits them, holding it responsible for its own misdeeds unmitigated by those of another.

For the difference made between Great Britain and France, by the application of the non-importation act against England only, the motive has been already too often explained, and is too well known to require further illustration. In the commercial restrictions to which the United States resorted as an evidence of their sensibility, and a mild retaliation of their wrongs, they invariably placed both powers on the same footing, holding out to each in respect to itself, the same accommodation, in case it accepted the condition offered, and in respect to the other, the same restraint, if it refused. Had the British government confirmed the arrangement, which was entered into with the British Minister in 1809, and France maintained her decrees, with France would the United States have had to resist, with the firmness belonging to their character, the continued violation of their rights. The committee do not hesitate to declare, that France has greatly injured the United States, and that satisfactory reparation has not yet been made for many of those injuries. But, that is a concern which the United States will look to and settle for themselves. The high character of the American people, is a sufficient pledge to the world, that they will not fail to settle it, on conditions which they have a right to claim.

More recently, the true policy of the British government towards the United States has been completely unfolded. It has been publicly declared by those in power, that the orders in council should not be repealed until the French government had revoked all its internal restraints on the British commerce, and that the trade of the United States, with France and her allies, should be prohibited until Great Britain was also allowed to trade with them. By this declaration it appears, that to satisfy the pretensions of the British government, the United States must join Great Britain in the war with France, and prosecute the war, until France should be subdued, for without her subjugation, it were in vain to presume on such a concession. The hostility of the British government to these states has been still further disclosed. It has been made manifest that the United States are considered by it as the commercial rival of Great Britain, and that their prosperity and growth are incompatible with her welfare. When all these circumstances are taken into consideration, it is impossible for your committee to doubt the motives which have governed the British Ministry in all its measures towards the U. States since the year 1805. Equally is it impossible to doubt, longer, the course which the United States ought to pursue towards Great Britain.

From this view of the multiplied wrongs of the British government since the commencement of the present war, it must be evident to the *impartial world*, that the contest which is now forced on the United States, is radically a contest for their sovereignty and independence. Your committee will not enlarge on any of the injuries, however great, which have had a transitory effect. They wish to call the attention of the House to those of a permanent nature only, which intrench so deeply on our most important rights, and wound so extensively and vitally our best interests, as could not fail to deprive the United States of the principal advantages of their revolution, if submitted to. The control of our commerce by Great Britain, in regulating at pleasure, and expelling it almost from the ocean; the oppressive manner in which these regulations have been carried into effect, by seizing and confiscating such of our vessels, with their cargoes, as were said to have violated her edicts, often without previous warning of their danger; the impressment of our citizens from on board our vessels, on the high seas, and elsewhere, and holding them in bondage until it suited the convenience of their oppressors to deliver them up, are encroachments of that high and dangerous tendency which could not fail to produce that pernicious effect, nor would these be the only consequences that would result from it. The British government might, for a while, be satisfied with the ascendency thus gained over us, but its pretensions would soon increase. The proof, which so completely and disgracefal a submission to its authority, would afford of our degeneracy, could not fail to inspire confidence that there was no limit to which its usurpations and our degradation might not be carried.

Your committee, believing that the freeborn sons of America are worthy to enjoy the liberty which their fathers purchased at the price of so much blood and treasure, and seeing in the measure adopted by Great Britain, a course commenced and persisted in which might lead to a loss of national character and independence, feel no hesitation in advising resistance by force, in which the Americans of the present day will *prove* to the *enemy* and to the world, that we have not only inherited that liberty which our fathers gave us, but also the WILL and the POWER to maintain it. Relying on the patriotism of the nation, and confidently trusting that the Lord of Hosts will go with us to battle in a righteous cause and crown our efforts with success—your committee recommend an immediate appeal to ARMS.

LOOK AT THIS!

No longer since than October last, Governor Griswold communicated to the legislature of Connecticut, a message, from which we give the following extracts—Let those who advocate SUBMISSION rather than WAR, *look at it!*

☞ "*Intelligent men will perceive that our public concerns require something more than a repeal of particular obnoxious laws.*"

☞ "The interests of the United States undoubtedly require a secure and honorable peace; but the only guarantee which ought, can with safety be relied upon for this object is a sufficient organized force, and a spirit to USE IT WITH EFFECT, *when no other honorable means of redress can be resorted to.*"

☞ "The extensive resources, aided by geographical situation of our country, have furnished every necessary means for defending TERRITORY *and our* CONSTITUTION, *and we* RAISE TO OURSELVES *when* EITHER *is* INVADED WITH IMPUNITY."

Those who think Governor Griswold to have led up measures of opposition set a much less value upon inconsistency has in this respect very properly been to it by his excellency.

Capt R. WAITE, arrived [illegible] fmd on Wednesday from [illegible] forms, that Col. Cuthbert [illegible] vannah 9th inst from St. Mary's [illegible] ders from gov. Mitchell to c[illegible] untters togo to E. Florida.